



City of Hampton, VA

Meeting Minutes

City Council

22 Lincoln Street
Hampton, VA 23669
www.hampton.gov

Linda Curtis
W. H. "Billy Hobbs, Jr.
Will Moffett
George E. Wallace, Mayor

Chris Snead
Christopher G. Stuart
Donnie R. Tuck

Staff:
Mary Bunting, City Manager
Vanessa Valldejuli, City Attorney
Katherine K. Glass, CMC, Clerk of Council

Wednesday, February 26, 2014

1:02 PM

Council Chambers, 8th Floor, City Hall

CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

GEORGE E. WALLACE PRESIDED

PRESENT: Chris Snead, Christopher G. Stuart, Donnie R. Tuck

ABSENT: Linda Curtis, W. H. "Billy" Hobbs, Jr., Will Moffett

AGENDA

Mayor Wallace noted that Vice Mayor Curtis and Councilman Moffett are acting as representatives of Council at a conference primarily focusing on youth violence and best practices currently being initiated around the Nation. The City may adapt those practices to assist with the recent violence. He emphasized that this was a critical mission. Additionally, Councilman Hobbs is out with the flu.

1. 14-0108 Briefing on 2014 General Assembly Session

City Manager Mary Bunting introduced Ms. Laura Bateman, who represents the City in Richmond through Bateman Consulting. She will be providing an update on the City's legislative package and the larger issues that were not initially in the City's package but have arisen during the General Assembly session and affect local government. A copy of this presentation has been attached to these minutes.

Ms. Bateman noted that the last time she was before Council, the legislative package was being finalized. The biggest issue identified at that time was the Fort Monroe Authority (FMA). She stated that both Delegate Gordon Helsel's FMA bill and Senator Mamie Locke's FMA bill were reported from the opposite chamber with an amendment that includes the Lieutenant Governor coming onto the FMA. Now that those bills have crossed over, they must go back to the chamber of origin for the amendment to be agreed to. She is not anticipating a problem and those will become law on July 1st.

Ms. Bateman stated that the next piece of legislation is the Criminal Justice Training Fund to allow the City of Hampton to access the training fund fee and use the fees

collected through court fines to help offset costs to the Hampton Independent Criminal Justice Training Academy. Those two bills will be through the process as of this afternoon. One change to the bills that does not affect Hampton narrows the window for other independent academies to access the fund. Hampton will be able to use those funds starting July 1st.

Ms. Bateman noted that the biggest issue identified for Hampton was the elimination of the Payment in Lieu of Taxes (PILOT) cap. She stated that the budget process works by the House of Delegates and the Senate each having amendments to the Governor's proposed budget, which is Governor McDonnell's last budget. The cap removal and the language to affect the cap coming off made it into the Senate budget, but did not make it into the House budget, despite discussions with all members of the relevant subcommittee. She stated that her company is working hard to ensure that the Conference Committee report between the House and Senate budget conferees does include the language for the cap to come off and for the FMA to pay the amount owed to the City as per the statute.

Ms. Bateman noted that the City was successful in obtaining \$3 million from the State to help with Langley Air Force Base (AFB) clear zone property acquisition from willing sellers. This was matched by the City and property acquisition has begun. There is additional money needed to finish that process to make sure that Langley is protected from any subsequent Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) commission. The City is working to get \$2 million in FY15 and \$2 million in FY16, also to be matched by the City. She stated that the House budget funded this for \$500,000 in FY15 only. They took the money from the Federal Area Contingency Trust (FACT) fund, a fund under Governor McDonnell that is being reverted into the General Fund. The House has appropriated that money into the Secretary of Veterans Affairs budget to fund this issue. She stated that it doesn't matter where the money comes from, so she is working to make sure that is funded. She stated that budget issues have been taking a lot of time, and it is not always done in a committee process.

Councilman Tuck noted that Ms. Bateman had spoken about the movement of money and that he was not sure what this entailed. He asked if the additional \$1.5 million is somewhere else and she is anticipating it will be appropriated for this project.

Ms. Bateman noted that the uncommitted balance from the FACT fund was a fund that Governor McDonnell set up to help with base closure issues and provide a cushion for the downturn in the economy and the defense industry. She stated that she is not certain where an additional \$1.5 million would come from, but she is making the case that it will be cheaper for the City to resolve these issues now rather than to wait for something untoward to happen at Langley AFB.

Councilman Stuart noted that he assumed the PILOT cap removal moved through the Senate after being introduced by Senator Locke. Ms. Bateman stated that the budget amendment to the budget language to remove the cap was introduced in the House by Delegate Helsel and in the Senate by Senators Tommy Norment, John Miller, and Mamie Locke. She noted that, at the time, Senator Norment was the only Peninsula legislator that served on the Senate Finance Committee and was in a great position to be the lead patron on that issue. Senator Locke is now a member of the committee, as well. She stated that all members of the Peninsula delegations have been working really hard to make sure that language is approved.

Councilman Stuart asked why the House was having trouble getting the cap language removed. Ms. Bateman stated that she wished there was a magical answer, but Delegate Helsel is working very hard on the issue. Not being on one of the financial committees makes it more difficult. Out of the 100 members in the House of Delegates, there are 22 on the Appropriations Committee, and they have every member approaching them for every budget amendment for their respective districts. There is no one on the Appropriations Committee from this area at this point. She noted that just because it was not in the House budget does not mean it will not be in the final budget Conference Committee report. Councilman Stuart stated that he has spoken with Delegate Helsel both publically and privately about the PILOT issue and clear zone funding. Councilman Stuart asked what the Council can do to assist Delegate Helsel on this important issue. Ms. Bateman stated that letting Senator Norment and the budget conferees know how important this is to the City will help. She noted that she is doing this on a daily basis.

Councilman Stuart left the Chambers at 1:18 p.m.

Councilman Tuck asked what the City's plan was if it only receives \$500,000 for clear zone acquisitions. Ms. Bunting stated that the City is still making progress with the property owners and ascertaining their interest. As they indicate interest, the City has been doing appraisals to ensure that it is purchasing property for reasonable prices. There is a requirement for the funds provided by the Commonwealth that property should only be bought from willing sellers. Property owners have been informed that it is a first come, first served situation. Property owners have also been informed that when the money on hand is depleted, they will be put on a waiting list. If the City only receives \$500,000, the City would provide matching funding, resulting in \$1 million to buy additional property. As much as it is a priority to buy as much of that property from willing sellers as possible, she would not advocate for providing more than a State match, because the State used the match program for Virginia Beach and Oceana, and the Langley Clear Zone properties are as important, if not more important, for the City, Peninsula, and Commonwealth. She emphasized that this should not be accelerated exclusively with local funds, but Richmond should be pressured to offer the same benefits to Hampton that it did to Virginia Beach. The City would try to get more money next year if only \$500,000 is funded in this budget. She stated that a new Governor might be more receptive than Governor McDonnell and a new General Assembly might be more receptive than the current one.

Councilman Tuck asked if the City had invested the \$6 million from current fiscal year, or if the money had been spent. Ms. Bunting stated that the City has not spent all of it, but has bought some properties. Initially, the City had asked for more funding than was provided because more funds would be needed to acquire all the properties identified in the Joint Land Use Study. She wasn't sure of the running balance, but could provide those firm numbers for Council. She stated that she believes there will be additional willing sellers after the money has been depleted.

Ms. Bateman stated that the last budget amendment in the legislative package was for the Virginia Air & Space Center (VASC) in partnership with Christopher Newport University (CNU) to pilot a Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math (STEM) initiative. CNU tried very hard in their higher education budget to accommodate the museum, but was not successful. She stated that all is not lost because the Governor, in his introduced budget, included \$150,000 in FY15 and \$150,000 in FY16 for the two

museums on the Peninsula, VASC and the Virginia Living Museum, for a STEM pilot project. The museums each got \$75,000 with the science museum last year, so this is a nice partnership and helpful appropriation. Because that money was in the introduced budget, and there are no amendments to take it out, the item is in a good position.

Ms. Bateman noted that last week, Governor McAuliffe's finance team delivered bad news to the Senate Finance and House Appropriations Committees, reducing the revenue forecast for the State by \$140 million, \$125 million for the remainder of FY14 and another \$15 million in FY15. The Governor did not recommend any changes to the basic economic assumptions that drive the forecast, but the McAuliffe administration is committed to a scenario that calls for modest economic growth in the next biennial. Each chamber passed their budget amendment packages last week and now requires its Conference Committee to reconcile the differences. Staff work on the Conference Committee has already begun. These are not open meetings, but the information sharing is ongoing. The delegates and senators that make up the Conference Committee will hopefully have a budget recommendation before the General Assembly is due to adjourn March 8th.

Ms. Bateman noted that, apart from Hampton specific issues, the bottom line is that the Senate of Virginia increased spending over the introduced budget while the House reduced overall spending. Major differences between the two chambers exist in elementary and secondary education, health and human services, public safety, economic development, natural resources, and compensation.

Ms. Bateman discussed some of the issues facing education because of its importance. The Opportunity Education Institution, also known as the "School Takeover Legislation," is being challenged in the courts. By legislation and by budget action, it would appear that this concept from the McDonnell administration will be going away. Another piece of legislation coming out of the McDonnell administration is the A-F school grading system. There is a House bill that delays the effect of that legislation for another year, and a Senate bill that would delay it for three years. She estimated that there will be something in between the two agreed upon, but it will definitely be put off for at least one year. Important to Hampton is the Virginia Preschool Initiative, which has been funded by the Senate budget, but not by the House budget. There is support from a variety of organizations and preschool is a priority of this Governor. She stated that she believes funding will be provided in a compromise. She noted that another big education issue is the Standards of Learning (SOL) reform. There is a bill that will be passed reducing the number of SOL tests by 23%, focusing on grades 3 through 8, and creating the SOL innovation committee that will have broad stakeholder participation. The reform has been an open and inclusive process.

Mayor Wallace asked about the current status of the Steam Academy funding. Ms. Bateman stated that there was a budget amendment introduced in both chambers to advance planning funds. This money was found on the Senate side, but not on the House side. There are many groups working on that to see that it is funded in the Conference Committee. She stated that it was introduced by Senator Normont and Delegate Helsel. Ms. Bunting stated that this was still planned for Fort Monroe. Ms. Bateman confirmed this. She stated that part of the budget amendment advanced some of the summer programming as well, but the bulk of it is for planning for dormitories and the like.

Ms. Bateman reviewed important economic development issues. The Port of Hampton Roads dredging will take place, but there is no information on the source of the money at this time. There are several different funding sources being considered. The Economic Development Zone grant program has different levels of funding in each chamber. She stated that she believes this will initially be funded with at least \$1 million. There were several bills this year dealing with Enterprise Zones, some of which tried to open the Enterprise Zone program. There are budget amendments to increase the amount of money available for Enterprise Zones. The specific legislation was carried over until FY15, and she believes it bodes well that the Secretary of Commerce and Trade will be convening a task force to deliberate on this program.

Ms. Bateman highlighted some transportation issues. Funding for primary pavement in cities and towns that maintain their own roads was a position statement in the Hampton legislative package. The coalitions of which the City is a part, such as Virginia First Cities (VFC) and Virginia Municipal League (VML), were successful in clarifying into statute that cities and towns are eligible for funding for the reconstruction of pavement for primary roads. There was also the creation of the Hampton Roads Transportation Accountability Commission (HRTAC). The legislation moving through the General Assembly is comprised of 14 localities in the planning district, two senators, two delegates, and four non-voting ex officio members. The bill moves the responsibility from approval of projects and the priority of such projects pursuant to the Hampton Roads Transportation Fund to the HRTAC. The bill directs the Hampton Roads Transportation Planning Organization (HRTPO) and the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) to assist HRTAC in its formation and transfer the responsibility for transportation goals from the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) to the new HRTAC. Another bill staggers the terms of the Hampton Roads Transportation District Commission (HRTDC). This bill is in flux. There was a late breaking amendment yesterday afternoon on the Senate floor that would extend the terms of the appointees from Hampton, Chesapeake, and Norfolk until July 1, 2018.

Ms. Bateman stated that the issue of Medicaid will likely result in local governments wondering how reliable a funding partner the State will be for FY15. The Senate's budget proposal includes a plan to expand Medicaid, which its advocates are calling "Marketplace Virginia." The House has no room for Medicaid expansion in their budget. The House Republicans have called the Senate proposal an example of Washington-style politics that could threaten funding for schools, public safety, and teachers. She stated that this is the issue for the 2014 GOP dominated House of Delegates, and it is hard to see how the two chambers will resolve this impasse.

Mayor Wallace noted that one of the issues that was contentious for the local roads and streets was the desire to make the same appropriations and expenditures available to cities as they do rural areas. They did not take into account all the infrastructure that city and urban streets have, such as wastewater lines, that are not associated with rural roads. Consequently, VFC and VML asked for a different appropriation for city and urban streets. It appears that at least some attention is being addressed to the situation. Mayor Wallace noted that the governance of the new revenues associated with the transportation funding, and relationship between the MPO and the new entity of HRTAC, which has been crafted after what already exists in Northern Virginia, is still in a state of flux. There are still some contentious issues being negotiated in the General Assembly.

PRESENTED by Laura Bateman.

2. 14-0060 Waterways Management Monthly Report

Ms. Bunting introduced Ms. Gayle Hicks, Water Resources Engineer, who leads the waterways efforts in Public Works. She will be presenting on the progress made since the citizen Waterways Steering Committee identified strategies for the City. A copy of this presentation has been attached to these minutes.

Ms. Hicks noted that the Waterways Steering Committee was part of the Comprehensive Plan process. The City Manager appointed 19 members to the committee, noting that many of the original members were still involved. The purpose was to provide advice and guidance in four areas of interest: flooding, dredging, water quality/quantity, and shoreline protection. The committee was formed in September 2010 and gave their report to Council in March 2012. She stated that this accomplishment was no easy feat.

Ms. Hicks shared a chart of the committee recommended strategies. She noted that the chart is rather overwhelming and stated that she had provided a more legible version for Council in hardcopy. She stated that the strategies are ranked from top to bottom, from years 2011 through 2016. The total for all years in 2011 dollars is over \$50 million. Mayor Wallace asked Ms. Hicks to emphasize this total. She agreed that it was a large number. Ms. Bunting emphasized that all \$50 million has not been funded. This is everything the citizens felt would be appropriate actions to take, but there was an understanding from the beginning that the City would have to balance all those recommendations in the context of the City's financial resources. The five year plan developed invests approximately \$20 million with the idea of making as much progress as possible and then attempt to do projects that were identified for later years. As the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) is rolled forward, additional money is added; not all the recommendations have been funded as of yet. The recommendations will not all be funded by 2016 as the City's financial resources would not allow for that. Ms. Hicks stated that the City is making good progress.

Ms. Hicks explained the organization of her simplified chart. Tidal flooding is blue, stormwater is orange, shoreline protection is green, and waterways management is pink. She then grouped each subcommittee's recommendations for each year and shortened the descriptions to three or four words. She also included departments as there are multiple departments involved in each activity, and not all are led by or involve Public Works. She also provided the status of each project. Green is complete, and there are some specific projects mentioned by the Waterways Steering Committee that have already been completed. She stated that a lot of projects are underway and marked as yellow. Some of the projects marked with yellow will remain that way always because they are recurring tasks for each year. While the list of new projects gets smaller as the years go on, the overall cost gets larger because some tasks occur every single year. Projects marked with blue are projects that are not feasible or they have insufficient staff support. She noted that there are only a few of those. Projects marked with purple are currently not funded, although they may be included in the 5-year CIP.

Ms. Hicks stated that the committee had recommended that the City have a Tidal Flood Protection Plan. It is a three part plan that includes a ready resource brochure, a report on sea level rise and mitigation, and the Geographic Information Systems (GIS) mapping that allows for searching by neighborhood to track rising tidal flood waters. This will allow people to plan for evacuations or hazard mitigation. The City's outreach on this plan will

take place on March 27th. This plan was the recommendation of the Tidal Flood Subcommittee. Also for tidal flooding, they recommended that the City adopt an emergency management or Community Emergency Response Team (CERT), which is a citizen-based response team. This has been done and there is information about joining CERT on the Emergency Management website.

Ms. Hicks noted that two things recommended by the Stormwater Subcommittee were improved accuracy of stormwater records and conducting a rate study. Both have been completed and the billing records were updated in FY14.

Ms. Hicks stated that the Shoreline Protection Subcommittee recommended transferring the Dune Act to the Wetlands Board. The City agrees that this should be done; however, additional resources are needed for implementation.

Ms. Hicks noted that some members of the Waterways Management Subcommittee were present and that the City has been working with them since December. The first two projects they recommended were to support marine businesses and improve utilization of waterways. These have been labeled as yellow because the City currently does these things, but there is room for improvement. The City provides funding to organizations who in turn directly market marine related businesses, so money is not given directly to private businesses. She also noted the Director of the Convention and Visitors Bureau is currently promoting marine related activities such as the Caribbean 1500. These are under the jurisdiction of Economic Development, and Public Works is working with them. She stated that there might be ways for them to reconsider what is currently being done. The subcommittee also wanted to maintain the Waterways Advisory Group. The City has done this and she noted that the City Manager wants to initiate regular meetings for that group.

Ms. Hicks stated that the total price associated with the 2011 projects was \$595,000. She noted that the recommendations didn't come until late 2011, and therefore within the FY12, so the City was behind on the projects before they got started. For 2012, the total price was \$2.2 million.

Ms. Hicks stated that in 2012, the City was able to expand the emergency notification system by purchasing a new system that is faster and easier to customize. The City was also able to acquire free LiDAR (Light Radar) from the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and then hire a consultant to turn it into a product the City can use. For shoreline protection, part of the current breakwaters project at Salt Ponds was to locate the sand trap that was part of the original project. The City also checked the current condition of the mouth of the inlet, which is in good shape according to the consultant. A full survey of the inlet will occur in 2014.

Ms. Hicks noted that the inventory of the waterways and establishing waterway baselines require more research. She contacted the consultant about what it would cost to do a small inventory. For five waterways, the consultant gave an estimate of \$100,000 to do a spot hydrographic survey. This includes a visual survey which would look at the current use of those waterways and the traffic on them. The City currently monitors the Salt Ponds Inlet and Buckroe Beach on a yearly basis. She stated that the committee would probably consider this insufficient and desire a more comprehensive plan. She stated that a maintenance and monitoring program would require Council to consider the long-term commitment that would be involved. She stated that these programs cannot

be entered into lightly and other communities are handling it in a different way. Virginia Beach is currently setting up a special tax district to make improvements and front-ending the cost. She stated that the City could also study an alternative funding mechanism so that the CIP process would not be overburdened with these projects. She stated that these are things the City is working on, but there needs to be discussion about where the City really wants to go with these projects. She reiterated that it was the hope of the committee that the City would set up a line item in the General Fund that would strictly be based on the revenues that the City receives from the waterfront properties to be used specifically for waterways improvements. Currently, the City is using the CIP process to do that and decisions are made based on available resources.

Ms. Hicks stated that for 2013, there was a recommendation to mitigate flooding and the Corps of Engineers is doing a resilience study for pump stations in the flood plain. This was started ahead of their funding, so this has not been 100% funded. This will make improvements to the pump stations that will minimize damage to the stations and put them back online more quickly. It recognizes the fact that these stations will flood, but there are things the City can do to put them back online as quickly as possible with a minimum of flood damage. That information can also be used to request funding for some of these projects.

Ms. Hicks noted that for the increased inspection and enforcement recommendation, the Stormwater Utilities will pay for seven new positions, one of which is in the City Attorney's Office. The remaining six are in engineering and drainage maintenance. The Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation (DCR) is giving the City a grant towards hiring a few of those positions. That program will be more complicated than in the past, which is the reason behind increasing staffing. The City will also now be issuing the State's construction general permits. This satisfies the increased inspection and enforcement recommendation because there will be a permit coordinator, an assistant permit coordinator, a Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) permit coordinator, and three construction inspectors. These inspectors will inspect not just erosion and sediment control, but stormwater and the stormwater pollution prevention plan.

Ms. Hicks stated that one of the waterways maintenance recommendations is preventative measures to reduce sediment to waterways. The State regulations that are going into effect in July are aimed at doing this. Another recommendation was to increase the dredging cycle at the Salt Ponds Inlet. She stated that this project was listed in FY16 and FY18. She stated that she is supportive of doing the project in FY16, which will make improvements to the south jetty because that jetty is low. Currently, sand that is placed on the Salt Ponds beach finds its way back into the inlet and the City must dredge it again, creating a cycle. If improvements are made, the City might be able to increase that dredging cycle considerably. The last recommendation was for expanded traditional funding sources.

Councilman Tuck asked about the MS4 permits. Ms. Hicks explained that this is a permit the City has through the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) which relates to US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) requirements.

Councilman Tuck asked about the Salt Ponds Inlet permanent improvements. He stated that three or four months ago, costs for those improvements were given. At the time, it was stated that the payback did not make it feasible to make those improvements and

that the City would be better off dredging the inlet every two or four years. He asked if it was her recommendation that the City do these improvements. Ms. Hicks clarified that it was her recommendation to do the south jetty improvements, which is the one suggested for FY16 because it is contributing to the problem. If those improvements can be funded, the dredging cycle could be improved. Mayor Wallace asked if she was referencing engineering studies on which to base these recommendations. Ms. Hicks confirmed that she was, and that the sediment that is transported along the Chesapeake Bay shoreline is in the Hampton Shoreline Protection Manual. She stated that she is in contact with the main consultant that the City has used since 1992. These improvements were referenced in the last Salt Ponds Inlet study, which is online for the public. It states that these issues are contributing factors to the inlet needing to be dredged as often as it is.

Councilman Tuck asked how much she anticipated the cost will increase by waiting. Last year, the Council was presented with an estimated cost and now the proposed improvements won't be made for at least another year. Ms. Hicks stated that she has added the cost of inflation to the original costs already. The money that is requested in FY16 for the south jetty improvements is a good estimate of what it will actually cost, about \$1 million.

Ms. Hicks noted that the budget for the 2014 recommendations total over \$11 million, but only include a short list of items, simply because the tasks listed in the previous years continue each year. She emphasized that it is important that people understand how dramatically the City's stormwater regulations are going to change and the requirements that will be expected. Currently, the City goes out and inspects for erosion and sediment control. After July 1, 2014, the City will be inspecting for erosion and sediment control, stormwater, and for the stormwater pollution prevention plan. Inspectors are being added because each site will take longer. All of these are aimed at retaining stormwater on site. The City does not want anything to reach the Bay, but be treated on site. All the regulations are aimed at treatment on site, infiltration practices, and preventing sediment from running off. Sediment is a silty clay with a positive charge and attracts other items with which it combines. If that sediment is then released into the waterways, it settles to the bottom and is difficult to remove.

Ms. Hicks stated that 100% of water quantity is going to be retained on site, with a possibility of more, because designers will elect to retain more in order to avoid having to do an expensive report about the downstream analysis. At least 80% of the water quality will be on site. This is not currently being done to the extent that it will be in the future. Currently, it is based on the City's percentage of impervious surfaces, which is 34% for Hampton. With the new regulations, the entire State is required to be reduced to 14%. Most projects will be providing water quality. In the past, the City provided water quality for anything over 34% because the City was not allowed to make the Bay any worse, but now that reduction requires at least double the amount of treatment that will be done on site.

Councilman Tuck stated that he believed there was an article in Governing Magazine about resilient cities, and Norfolk qualified as a resilient city. He stated that Norfolk's profile is not much different than Hampton's, with a rising sea level and sinking shores. He asked if Hampton tried to qualify for this designation, and why Norfolk obtained this classification but Hampton did not. Ms. Hicks stated that the City did not pursue this program, but there are many other things the City is pursuing. She stated that all the

neighboring localities learn from each other. When Norfolk started with their citizens' waterways group, it was vastly different than Hampton's. Hampton started with a yearlong citizen outreach, while Norfolk started by using a consultant and then doing their citizen outreach. She noted that Public Works used to have a grant writer, who has since left. She was successful in obtaining approximately \$700,000 in grants for the waterways projects, and over \$1 million for the City overall. Ms. Bunting stated that this opening will be filled. One of the recommendations from the Waterways Committee was a grant writer position, and while it is currently vacant, it has not been eliminated. Ms. Hicks stated that Hampton is in a little bit better shape than Norfolk, because they are lower than Hampton and have approximately 54% impervious surfaces. They also have some unique problems in their older neighborhoods.

Ms. Bunting stated that the full schedule of activity is found online with the agenda package. There are many actions taken that Ms. Hicks did not describe given time limitations, such as living shorelines and breakwaters. She introduced Mr. Steve Shapiro, Deputy Director of Community Development, to discuss staff actions from another recommendation from the Waterways Committee. This will require action from Council, although no action is required today.

Mr. Shapiro stated that when FEMA gives the City the flood maps it adopts, there is a base flood elevation. Freeboard is the design above the base flood elevation. Currently in Hampton, the Council adopted a one foot freeboard in August 2011. This means that if your flood zone is level 8, you must build to nine feet above sea level for your finished floor. He stated that both Norfolk and Virginia Beach recently increased their freeboard level by three feet and two feet respectively. A committee has been established to look at a number of changes, including freeboard.

Mr. Shapiro shared a chart displaying several changes that will be considered over the next six months. The City would like to move to a three foot freeboard. Before this is done, a lot of outreach will be done to Peninsula homebuilders, realtors, and civic associations.

Mr. Shapiro stated that the Coastal A Zone is a new designation. Currently in Hampton, Flood Zone A is the typical flood zone and Flood Zone V is the coastal high hazard area. There is now a Coastal A Zone that takes into account waves of 1.5-3 feet, so it is not at the V level of three foot waves, and it is not as low as Flood Zone A. The City would consider adopting Coastal A regulations, which are predominantly building regulations, such as requiring pilings, engineer designs for the foundation, breakaway walls below the elevation. Outside of the Flood Zone A, there is Flood Zone X, which is the 500-year flood zone. There are no requirements currently in that zone. There is consideration to require those structures to be raised 18-inches above grade or flood proofed.

Mr. Shapiro stated that the City currently measures the height of buildings from the finished grade of the structure. However, if a three foot freeboard is required, a builder should not be penalized. The current maximum height in residential areas is 35 feet, so if the foundation has to be at three feet, the height maximum should be adjusted to accommodate that. This would mean measuring from the required elevation instead of the finished grade.

Mr. Shapiro stated that a final recommendation is about bringing an existing building into compliance with current regulations. It is only required currently if there is damage or

improvements done in excess of 50% of the market value. For example, if a house is worth \$100,000 and the owner wants to construct a \$60,000 addition, the existing structure would need to be changed. There are two options under consideration. The first is cumulative loss or improvement, which means that over a 10-year period, if the sum of damages or improvements to a structure is 50% of the market value of the building, then they would need to improve the existing structure. The other possibility is repetitive loss, which means that if the average damage of two events equals 25% of the market value, the owner must bring the existing structure into compliance.

Mr. Shapiro noted that Norfolk considered some of these events and some they implemented. The City will be considering these options and discussing them with various stakeholders in over the next six months.

Councilman Tuck noted that if he had a \$100,000 structure and wanted to add an additional \$60,000 structure to it, he would then have to take that \$100,000 structure and make it meet these requirements. He stated that this would dissuade him from making a \$60,000 improvement, in which case, the City loses the additional assessed value or the value of that addition. He asked if this was an unintended consequence or something that was anticipated. Mr. Shapiro stated that this was the current regulation, and if it was attempted, the current structure would need to be lifted until it met the current standards. This is a requirement for the City to be a part of the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP). He stated that he was describing changing this to be in a cumulative or repetitive loss also triggering this requirement.

PRESENTED by Gayle Hicks, Senior Civil Engineer, and Steve Shapiro,
Deputy Director of the Community Development Department.

3. 14-0106 Hazard Mitigation Program Update

Ms. Bunting introduced Ms. Hui-Shan Walker, Emergency Management Coordinator. She noted that this topic was related to the Waterways Committee recommendations. One of the strong recommendations was that the City look at home elevations in a more aggressive way. In response to that, the City set aside a home elevation loan program, which has not yet been accessed by citizens. This is because the City has been working on, and been successful in, maximizing Federal and State funding, using the loan program as a backstop to those. A copy of the presentation is attached to these minutes.

Ms. Walker stated that this was an update on the mitigation program within the City, where it is addressing one of the Waterways Tidal Flooding strategic areas by working on home elevations as one of the mitigation strategies that has been identified in the Peninsula Hazard Mitigation Plan.

Ms. Walker stated that the goal of the Hampton Hazard Mitigation Program is to help residents protect their homes from damage from future natural disasters. This has been done through a series of disaster preparedness outreach events, education, and training. The City also provides education on individual mitigation measures that homeowners can take to lessen the impacts of future events on their homes. The City has been aggressively applying for and working on managing the City's home elevation grants.

Ms. Walker noted that Emergency Management has a small, limited staff, but this project has gotten bigger and they needed the expertise of the other City departments. This led to the creation of the Natural Events Mitigation Steering and Advisory Committee (NEMSAC) made up of key stakeholders within the City. She stated that this group really helps Emergency Management analyze and prioritize the mitigation activities, as well as work through providing guidance and oversight on the projects. She noted that sometimes their point of view provides a different insight into providing strategic recommendations to the City Manager and Council. She stated that this group will also serve as a review panel for homeowner issues as homes are elevated.

Ms. Walker noted that the City is transitioning into addressing and targeting repetitive and severe repetitive loss properties. Repetitive loss properties are properties that have had two or more events where there are claims over 25% of the current value, and severe repetitive loss properties are properties that have experienced four or more claims to NFIP of \$5,000 or more.

Ms. Walker stated that current grant projects are addressing 25 of the City's 69 severe repetitive loss properties. This will help reduce the total of severe repetitive loss properties by 36%. The grants are also addressing 14 of the 83 repetitive loss properties, which will decrease the amount of repetitive loss properties by 17%. This year, Emergency Management will do more targeted outreach for the remaining properties for upcoming grant cycles. She noted that these grants do not just benefit the individual homeowners, but also the other homeowners within the City, because it improves the City's community rating system program, which currently lowers the City's residents' flood insurance policies by 10%.

Councilman Tuck noted that Ms. Walker had given the amounts of severe repetitive and repetitive loss properties as of July 2013. He stated that there were severe events that could cause flooding in August 2012, but then he could not remember any before 2009. He asked what timeline the July 2013 list was based on. Ms. Walker stated that the list is based on the last decade. FEMA takes the average during that time, and the City has actually challenged that amount, because homeowners have informed the City of more flooding than has been accounted for. She stated that if the City can prove a house meets the criteria, it can add it to FEMA's list.

Ms. Walker provided a chart of the current projects. DR-1862, which is the 2009 Nor'easter, was a small project, and the City has been increasing the amount of grants and project sizes since. There was a severe repetitive loss grant in FY12; DR-4024, which was Hurricane Irene funding; DR-4042, which was the earthquake; and, flood mitigation assistance from FY14. She stated that there are 37 homes in various stages of grants. There are five large, outstanding projects. Three have been awarded, for a total of approximately \$2.5 million. Two are currently under FEMA review, for a total of approximately \$4.5 million. This equates to approximately \$6.8 million the City has gone after, and she stated that she believes the City will be successful.

Ms. Walker stated that DR-1862 will elevate one of the severe repetitive loss properties in the Wythe area. The funding is approximately \$220,000 and the engineering designs are to be submitted to the Department of Emergency Management this month for approval. As of yesterday, the engineering company stated that the designs will be finished by the end of the week for submittal. Construction is targeted for May to June this year.

Ms. Walker stated that the severe repetitive loss grant program from FY12 will elevate six of the severe repetitive loss homes scattered throughout the City. There is a budget of approximately \$1 million, engineering designs are scheduled April-May this year with construction targeted for spring/summer 2015.

Ms. Walker stated that DR-4024 will elevate eight homes scattered throughout the City. The budget is approximately \$1.3 million and the award was just recently received. It will be brought to Council for appropriation in the near future and the performance period ends in December 2016.

Ms. Walker stated that the DR-4042 grant application has passed the FEMA eligibility review. Currently FEMA is performing the environmental and historical preservation (EHP) review to make sure all projects meet Federal guidelines before it is awarded. The application is for nine homes throughout the City for a total of approximately \$1.8 million.

Ms. Walker stated that the flood mitigation assistance grant was applied for last fall, and had to be broken into two projects. The first project was ranked as the top project out of all that was submitted into the Commonwealth. The City targeted all severe repetitive loss properties. FEMA is currently reviewing the application, which is for nine severe repetitive loss homes in Aberdeen and the Mercury/N King Street districts. The application was for \$1.5 million. She stated that this grant would provide 100% Federal funding for the elevation, with no State or local match required as in the other grants. The second project was ranked seventh and passed the initial cut. It was also called up to FEMA for review. After discussing it with counterparts across the Nation, it was determined that FEMA was looking for projects that would be covered by 100%, so that is what the City put in the applications. The application for project two is for four severe repetitive loss homes in the Wythe/Downtown/Fox Hill districts. This is also a no-match, 100% Federally funded grant for a total of \$875,000.

Ms. Walker stated that NEMSAC meets bimonthly and works through the progression on milestones for each of the grants. Projects are also prioritized for the next grant cycle, because there are homes that are ready for grants after working with interested homeowners. She noted that the application process is very long and challenging. She stated that NEMSAC is also working to develop additional projects that could be ready should a grant or funding opportunity present itself.

Ms. Walker stated that when she came before Council a few months ago, she had laid out steps on what Emergency Management was doing to build a framework on the mitigation program. She is pleased to say that this is in place. Although a lot of work goes into writing and submitting grants, the hard work comes after receiving money, in how the department manages the money, elevates the home, and brings about a successful conclusion. The committee and department are very committed to this. The State has recognized that Hampton has a very strong program framework in place, which is why they are willing to keep offering and awarding the City grants. She noted that other jurisdictions in the Region have been approaching the City about its program, which is a great indicator of the City's use of best practices.

Ms. Bunting acknowledged the Emergency Management staff for being aggressive about this program. The City has significantly increased the amount of money coming

into the community for home elevation, which is a real tribute to Ms. Walker and her staff.

PRESENTED by Hui-Shan Walker, Emergency Management Coordinator.

4. 14-0107 FY15 Budget Preview: Report on Community Input Sessions

Ms. Bunting noted that main budget presentations will begin in March with preliminary revenue estimates from Mr. Karl Daughtrey, Director of Finance. Hampton City Schools (HCS) is ahead of the City in releasing budget information because they are not dependent on the same revenue sources and their budget is largely driven by the State budget. The City's budget outreach began last night. There were 57 citizens polling, although more were in attendance. Ms. Bunting stated that the full presentation and polling options will be available online to the public next week. Today's presentation will be about what is covered during those public sessions and the feedback from last night. A copy of the presentation is attached to these minutes.

Ms. Bunting stated that the presentation begins by explaining to the public why the City is doing the presentation. She noted that there were several concerned citizens who felt that because the City was having these sessions, the City was looking at another 20-cent tax increase. She stated that this is absolutely not the case. These sessions of building the budget with public input were started in 2010, and she believes that it should continue each year regardless of the financial circumstances.

Ms. Bunting stated that the presentation then reviews the input received over the last four years. This is focused on because the City does not ask the same questions each year. For example, the first year was about needs versus wants, which generally does not change from year to year. However, it is important to acknowledge the previous input and remind citizens that this input is still reflected in what choices are made now.

Ms. Bunting stated that presentation then shares very preliminary budget projections, with the caveat that these are high level projections as strong revenue estimates will not be available until March. This is followed by preference polling around both the FY15 budget specifically and future years because it is important to look forward and acknowledge that the City is growing its way to an even better future. She noted that some people believe that budgetary gaps mean the City is not balancing its budget, but this is not the case. The budget has always been balanced, but the preliminary gap is one that must be focused on to make decisions about what will be cut in programs or raised in revenue. This is changing, and the City wants to make sure people leave with an understanding of what the City is doing to ensure that this changes.

Ms. Bunting stated that the presentation then reviews why the City has had a challenging four years. Almost all of the reasons are issues that are driven not by Hampton control and are not exclusive to the City, such as the National housing market crisis, the National recession, the State passing its budget while relying heavily on local funding and cutting funding to school systems dramatically. She noted that the City is already thinly manned compared to other localities. The City has eliminated and reduced services considered nonessential, restructured and consolidated departments to cut overhead, and combined services with schools or other entities. In many cases, the City takes longer to respond because staff has been downsized and couldn't commit to a

faster response time from years prior. Jobs vacancies have been held open longer to create vacancy savings. The City has also deferred capital projects and maintenance. All told, the City has cut approximately 170 full-time jobs, equivalent to 10% of the General Fund funded workforce.

Ms. Bunting stated that Dr. Linda Shifflette, Superintendent of HCS, then reviews the same items from HCS. Basically, they have had to do the same things as the City, such as closing six schools because of the loss of student enrollment, restructuring departments, and eliminating jobs. They have tried to protect the classroom and focus most of that reduction on the work personnel. They report having cut 431 full-time equivalent positions, or 14% of their workforce.

Ms. Bunting noted that last year, the City asked if the public wanted the City to continue to cut or to reinvest. Across all polling, nearly 90% of the citizens said that they didn't want additional cuts, although people felt differently about the amount of tax increase. In the end, the City raised taxes by 20-cents. Most residents, but not all, are still paying less than they did before the housing valuation declines. Citizens also said that they did not want the City to do large increases in the future, but change the rate incrementally. This led the Council Finance Committee to review the policy and propose changes that were ultimately adopted by Council. She emphasized that this is a guideline.

Mayor Wallace clarified that the Finance Committee is a not City Council committee, but a citizen committee, with various members of the community who have financial expertise. Ms. Bunting stated that it is called the Council Finance Committee because they are appointed by Council, but Council has always taken great care in putting experienced financial experts on the committee.

Ms. Bunting shared a chart that displayed how the 20-cents were invested. It covered a wide range of things, from offsetting the decline in real estate values to providing mandatory increases for City and HCS. She noted that for the first time in many years, the City provided a real, meaningful pay rate increase to HCS and City employees. She noted that the 2-cents for HCS were for the one-to-one initiative, which is underway.

Ms. Bunting stated that in response to the questions about why there was a big jump in the tax rate, and what would have happened in retrospect if the City had incrementally changed along the way, the Finance Committee calculated that the City would have raised the tax rate by 23-cents over the years. The financial policy that has been adopted states that when assessments go up, the tax rate should decrease, and when assessments are down, the tax rate should increase. This provides for a more stable bill for residents and would help keep service levels more consistent.

Ms. Bunting stated that the presentation then leads to the FY15 budget projections. As the Real Estate Assessor presented a few weeks ago, the real estate revenue continues to decline, although much less than in past years. The overall land book assessment decline for FY15 is projected to be 1.2%. Because this is not as steep a decline as in previous years, the City is optimistic that it is beginning to recover. Regional declines over the same period of time show that this issue is not unique to Hampton. She noted that areas that are generally considered better off financially, like Virginia Beach and Chesapeake, have been hit worse than some of the more urban areas. She noted that Northern Virginia had deeper declines as well. She stated that she hopes next year will be flat or improved in real estate values, but noted that this is a function of the overall

economic situation which is beyond the control of the Hampton Council or the Hampton business community generally.

Ms. Bunting stated that if Council chooses to apply that policy, there would be a one-cent tax rate increase this year. She noted that she emphasizes “if” in the presentations to the public because after a 20-cent tax increase raising taxes by even one penny doesn’t seem wise, but because it was something the citizens asked for, the Council Finance Committee recommended it and Council adopted it, it is important to acknowledge. This one-cent increase would attempt to keep the overall tax bills Citywide stable. If this is not done, the City will be losing \$1.21 million in revenues.

Ms. Bunting stated that half of the homeowners’ bills are not dropping this year, for the first time in several years. This means that half of the City’s homeowners would continue to pay the same or less as last year because they have a continued decline, but half of them will have an increase in their tax bill. She provided a list of what homeowners with an increase would be facing with a one-cent tax increase. She also shared graphs of the typical home in each subdivision and how this tax rate increase would affect each subdivision specifically. She stated that almost all of these continue to be less than in 2008, with a handful of exceptions. Fox Hill is one where the tax bill is essentially stabilizing. Aberdeen is paying more per year than in 2008 because the housing values have held steady over time. Generally speaking, more moderately priced homes have held value better across the Nation.

Ms. Bunting shared a chart that shows what the actual tax rate is for the City, with the one penny adjustment, compared to three neighborhoods from the City if the City was able to equalize bills based on neighborhood values. She stated that Virginia law requires one uniform rate for business and neighborhoods, but this chart gives sense of how tax rates vary differently if the City was trying to keep a tax bill constant.

Ms. Bunting shared a graph that shows the differences in the median tax bills of neighboring localities. She noted that citizens will ask why the tax rate is so much lower in Virginia Beach. This is because the median homes are worth more, and therefore produce more revenue to cover City services. This is why housing value is focused on in the community, in terms of redeveloping blighted properties that are underperforming and incentive grants through the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and other programs.

Ms. Bunting shared the breakdown of revenue loss if the tax rate is not increased by one-cent. Because the local school funding formula shares the revenue between the City and HCS on residential property, if it is declining, the cut is shared according to the formula. This means HCS will take a \$750,000 cut. She noted that this is included in their proposed deficit number. She stated for the record that when housing values improve, and they will ultimately improve hopefully sooner rather than later, the reverse is true. If the City was gaining \$1.2 million in residential real estate tax revenue, \$750,000 would go to HCS.

Ms. Bunting stated that last year residents asked why the City was looking exclusively at raising the real estate tax and not the car tax, because some neighboring localities were raising their car tax. Because of this, included in this year’s presentation is a graph showing that Hampton has one of the lower car tax rates. Newport News is at \$4.50 having raised their tax last year. If the City raised its rate 25-cents to match Newport

News, this would generate \$2.1 million. The City ultimately chose to focus on real estate taxes exclusively last year, because that is where the declines had come and the City would have been better off had it been adjusting the tax rate for equalization all along.

Ms. Bunting stated that the presentation then discusses the fact that costs keep rising. She stated that everyone has been impacted personally by prices at the gas pump. Unlike what some people think, the City and HCS are experiencing price increases, too. Gas prices multiplied by all of the vehicles the City has on the road, such as school buses, police cars, garbage trucks, etc., is an example of how the City's costs keep rising. The City needs revenue to grow to cover the increased costs of service delivery.

Ms. Bunting stated that the presentation then turns specifically to FY15, with the caution that not all revenue estimates are available. She noted that the things driving the budget projections right now are the real estate tax loss without a tax rate change, regional agencies mandatory increases such as the Regional Jail, a slight increase in debt service, and mandatory retirement and health insurance expenses. She stated that the Hampton Employee Retirement System (HERS) contributions from the City are rising slightly because of lack of investment earnings in the marketplace. She reported that the Virginia Retirement System (VRS) rate is going down, which is good news for the City. This is not the case for HCS because, although Hampton has always fully funded its actuarial requirement for VRS, HCS is part of a larger State pool and the General Assembly has not always fully funded their actuarial requirements. She also noted that the City is impacted by decisions not made by Council, providing the example of the Veteran service-connection property tax relief. This continues to grow for the City because it is a Veteran friendly community. As that grows, the City loses revenue. With all those items added, the City is looking at a preliminary gap between revenues and expenses of \$5 million to \$6 million. She stated that she hopes this amount decreases with the Regional Jail situation improving and Mr. Daughtrey's final revenue report.

Ms. Bunting noted that the presentation then discusses the cuts that were considered last year, but were for the most part rejected by the polling. She stated that those were not there to scare people, as some folks suggested, but because they are really where cuts can be made. If dramatic cuts are necessary, those items will be up for consideration again. She stated that she hopes the revenue gap will decrease and the City will be able to focus on less significant adjustments, such as deferring some capital investments or Master Plan investments, scaling back hours as opposed to closing facilities, and perhaps reducing contributions to outside agencies. She stated that all of these things have consequences and all of them are negative, so she would rather not do any of them, but the City must live within its means.

Ms. Bunting noted that the City will not be polling on those cuts again, because citizens have already polled on these choices. However, the input from last year is reflected upon and decisions will be made with those polling results under consideration.

Ms. Bunting stated that the presentation then turns to Dr. Shifflette who reviews HCS's situation. The HCS gap is driven by the State. HCS's VRS contribution requirement is going up very significantly, and over \$3 million of their gap is directly attributable to this increase. Actuarial requirements have not been met in past years. There is a chance that the General Assembly budget conferee committee may change some of this, as in the past, but right now HCS must plan for that gap. Additionally, HCS also has an increased HERS contribution requirement because of earnings being lackluster. They

also have increases in regional programs, and increases associated with part-time employees and the Affordable Care Act. She again noted the real estate tax loss that would occur if the tax rate is not changed. The HCS budget gap had been as high as \$10 million, but with some revisions, it is closer to \$7 million or \$8 million. Final General Assembly numbers are not yet available.

Ms. Bunting stated that Dr. Shifflette then discusses State funding, with Virginia ranking 8th in per capita personal income, but 32nd in terms of per capita State taxes. Virginia is a low tax State, which is a good thing, and one of the reasons the State is seen as business friendly. However, this suggests there is the ability to finance public education to a higher degree. The State also ranks 38th for per pupil funding for public education, but 13th in State corrections expenditures per offender. This shows a disconnect to some extent. When looking at the projected FY15 State revenues compared to FY09, HCS is receiving \$21.5 million less.

Ms. Bunting stated that Dr. Shifflette reviews the potential cuts for schools. For more information, she suggested the public watch the School Board meetings or attend the public sessions to hear directly from Dr. Shifflette, as Ms. Bunting is not versed in the details. She noted that Dr. Shifflette states the decisions made will have the least impact on the classroom.

Ms. Bunting stated that the presentation then shares questions that are often asked regarding the budget. This includes why the City can't use the savings account to fund HCS and the City. The savings account is one-time money, must be reserved, and the City's bond rating relies on that. She also discusses during the presentation how millions can be spent on projects, but not be able to avoid cuts. For example, people think that if a new courthouse is built or other such project, that money can be used instead on funding services. Those are funded with one-time revenues, such as bonds, the savings account, or dedicated revenue. Infrastructure upgrades on King Street or Kecoughtan are partially funded by VDOT grants that can only be used for those purposes. When the City can use the one-time funding sources, it tries to focus on projects that are legally required or that will grow the tax base.

Ms. Bunting stated that the polling begins after the initial presentation. She shared the results from the previous night. She noted that the poll was not representative of the City's ethnicity, but this will be corrected in the upcoming forums in different parts of the City. She stated that the current results were reflective of the area the forum was in last night.

Ms. Bunting noted that approximately 90% of those polling believe the State should provide its fair share and it is not currently doing so. She stated that she was very careful to explain that this area's delegation was not the issue here, as the delegation from this area is very pro-education in both the Senate and the House. Once this data has been gathered completely from the public polling and the online polling, it can be shared with the House and Senate leadership to try to effectuate a change in State policy over time.

Ms. Bunting stated that the next part of the presentation is about growing the City's way to a better tomorrow. Some things will change for the City simply because the economy is improving nationally and regionally. Dr. Shifflette states during the presentation that the way the HCS budget improves is through more students. More students enroll by HCS offering more choices, improving performance, and having better facilities. The City

will have improved tax revenues by attracting businesses, growing retail, having higher housing values, and more tourists.

Ms. Bunting stated that Dr. Shifflette then discusses how HCS is aiming to be the district of choice. She describes the various choice programs offered, the advantages of those, and how citizens can access these choice programs if they have a student in HCS. She also discusses the one-to-one initiative and the investment the City has made in upgrading their facilities.

Ms. Bunting shared a graph of what the City is trying to do to build a tax base so that it does not have to rely exclusively on existing homeowners. She stated that it takes nearly every penny of all the residential real estate taxes paid by all property owners in the City just to cover the local contribution to schools and their related capital expenses. This means all other City services, such as police, firefighters, libraries, Parks & Recreation, etc., are essentially paid for through business taxes, either directly by business owners or the consumer taxes that they generate, and personal property. Because the City has limited vacant land left, it will be difficult to get new subdivisions, which is how an area like Chesapeake grows its tax base over time. The remaining land in Hampton is largely environmentally impacted, so it is necessary to focus on redevelopment and getting homeowners to invest in their properties.

Ms. Bunting noted that the presentation also covers the City's largest tax revenues and ways to make those grow. During the presentation, she reviews the history of why the City needed to get involved in retail sales. She also discusses the Peninsula Town Center and the Power Plant, with \$9.9 million of the revenues in the City's budget coming directly from those two properties. For housing values, she focuses on the median values, and why it is important for the City to diversify the housing stock. She noted that the City does not have a lot of vacant land for new homes, so buying blighted properties and redeveloping them is an important strategy. During the presentation, she also discusses the business tax base and some of the success that the City has had. Citizens don't know about those successes, which is one of the reasons the City has launched the "Choose Hampton" campaign. She also discusses tourism and why more overnight stays and tax revenue is important. She stated that no final decisions have been made, but the City is looking at increasing its sports tourism capacity. She stated that the next part of the presentation is a discussion of the "Choose Hampton" campaign.

Ms. Bunting stated that this was concluded with preference polling on the investment options. She shared the results from the previous night's polling. After the final polling is done, timetables for the adoption of the HCS budget and City budget are shared, as well as when the next two public polling sessions are.

Ms. Bunting stated that this should provide Council with an overview of what the City is talking about with the public and what the response has been so far. At the next meeting, Mr. Daughtrey will present the revenue projections, as well as the final results from the polling sessions.

PRESENTED by Mary Bunting, City Manager.

REGIONAL ISSUES

NEW BUSINESS

CLOSED MEETING

5. 14-0110 Closed session pursuant to Virginia Code Sections 2.2-3711.A.7 for consultation with legal counsel regarding specific legal matters pertaining to downtown Hampton requiring provision of legal advice by such counsel.

COUNCIL did not convene a closed session.

CERTIFICATION

6. 14-0109 Resolution Certifying Closed Session

REMOVED - this resolution was not needed since a closed session was not convened. The meeting adjourned at 3 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

George E. Wallace
Mayor

Katherine K. Glass, CMC
Clerk of Council

Date approved by Council _____